arXiv:1004.3526v2 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 17 Aug 2010

Dynamic glass transition: bridging the gap between mode-coupling theory and the replica approach

Grzegorz Szamel

Department of Chemistry, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523

PACS `64.70.Q-` – Theory and modeling of the glass transition
PACS `05.20.-y` – Classical statistical mechanics
PACS `61.43.Fs` – Glasses

Abstract. - We clarify the relation between the ergodicity breaking transition predicted by mode-coupling theory and the so-called dynamic transition predicted by the static replica approach. Following Franz and Parisi [Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2486 (1997)], we consider a system of particles in a metastable state characterized by non-trivial correlations with a quenched configuration. We show that the assumption that in a metastable state particle currents vanish leads to an expression for the replica off-diagonal direct correlation function in terms of a non-trivial part of the replica off-diagonal static four-point correlation function. A factorization approximation for this function results in an approximate closure for the replica off-diagonal direct correlation function. The replica off-diagonal Ornstein-Zernicke equation combined with this closure coincides with the equation for the non-ergodicity parameter derived using the mode-coupling theory.

Introduction. – When trying to understand a new physical phenomenon one usually starts with a mean field theory and only afterwards one tries to account for fluctuation effects. The glass transition has been studied for many decades but theories which aspire to describe it at a mean field level, starting from a microscopic description of an interacting many-particle system, are quite recent. First, there is mode-coupling theory, derived in early eighties by Götze and collaborators [1, 2]. Second, there is the replica approach formulated in the late nighties by Mezard, Franz and Parisi [3–6]. While the latter theory makes references to the former, the precise relation between them is unclear (with the exception of disordered spin models). Our goal in this Letter is to bridge the gap between these theories.

The mode-coupling theory of the glass transition is, essentially, a self-consistent generalization of earlier mode-coupling approaches dealing with long-wavelength dynamics near critical points [7] and long-time tails in time-dependent correlation functions [8] to the dynamics of supercooled fluids at all length and time scales. The fundamental approximation of this theory consists in a factorization of a time-dependent four-point correlation function evolving with the so-called projected dynamics [2] (or, in the case of an overdamped system, with the so-called irreducible dynamics [9]). The somewhat mysterious nature of the four-point function involved, the uncontrolled factorization approximation, and the difficulty to calculate corrections have made the mode-coupling theory quite controversial. On the other hand, this theory makes a number of predictions [2] using as the only input the static structure of the system. Thus, it is verifiable and, therefore, it inspired a number of experimental and simulational studies. The major conclusion reached in pioneering simulations of Hansen and collaborators [10] is that the ergodicity breaking transition predicted by the mode-coupling theory corresponds to a dynamic crossover (originally named the kinetic glass transition) occurring at a density smaller than (or at a temperature larger than) that of the laboratory glass transition. Later simulations tested, *inter alia*, the wave-vector dependence of the so-called non-ergodicity parameter [11] and found a remarkable agreement with the predictions of the mode-coupling theory [12].

In contrast to the mode-coupling theory, the replica approach, as formulated by Mezard, Franz and Parisi [3–6] and further developed by Parisi and Zamponi [13, 14], is a purely static theory. It is rooted in the analysis of disordered spin models with long-range interactions (solvable exactly within mean-field theory) which exhibit the so-called one-step replica symmetry breaking. As showed in the remarkable series of papers by Kirkpatrick, Thirumalai and Wolynes [15], these models have two transitions, a dynamic transition at which time-dependent correlation functions stop decaying and a static transition at which the co-called configurational entropy (the logarithm of the number of metastable glassy states) vanishes. The dynamics of these models is described exactly by equations identical to the so-called schematic mode-coupling equations. The dynamic transition coincides with the ergodicity breaking transition predicted by the latter equations. The replica theory of Mezard, Parisi and collaborators builds upon Kirkpatrick *et al.*'s contribution and deals with the thermodynamic properties of supercooled many-particle systems without quenched disorder. It also predicts the existence of two transitions: the so-called dynamic transition at which the phase space of the system becomes split into a collection of metastable glassy states and the so-called ideal glass transition at which the configurational entropy vanishes. The former transition is identified with the ergodicity-breaking transition predicted by the mode-coupling theory.

It should be recalled at this point that the mode-coupling theory was not proposed as a mean-field theory of the glass transition. In fact, this theory descends from approaches that were derived to describe distinctly non-mean-field features of many-particle dynamics [7, 8].

In addition, there is another somewhat unclear aspect of the identification of the ergodicity breaking transition of the mode-coupling theory and the dynamic transition of the replica approach: both the locations of these transitions and the frozen-in correlations associated with them are markedly different. In particular, while the non-ergodicity parameter predicted by the mode-coupling theory agrees well with simulations [12], the one inferred [14] from the replica approach does not [3, 14]. Recently, it has been showed that the difference between the locations of the two transitions increases strongly with increasing spatial dimension [16, 17]. This fact, together with a surprising behavior of non-ergodicity parameters in high spatial dimensions, prompted Ikeda and Miyazaki [17] to question the validity of the mode-coupling theory.

The goal of this Letter is to clarify the relationship between the mode-coupling theory and the replica approach. We start with recalling that the replica approach is a general scheme that, in order to make quantitative predictions, has to be accompanied by specific approximations of the liquid state theory. Early versions of the replica approach [3, 5] used the so-called replicated hyper-netted chain approximation. Later versions [6, 13] used a molecular version of this approximation combined with the so-called small cage radius expansion. Finally, the most recent version [14] used an effective potential approach combined with the same small cage radius expansion. It was argued [6, 14] that the latter two approaches are well suited to describe dense glassy systems and the ideal glass transition. However, they are not appropriate to describe the dynamic transition, except in the limit of large spatial dimension [14]. Here we propose an alternative to the hyper-netted chain approximation used in Refs. [3, 5] that predicts the dynamic transition that coincides with the mode-coupling transition [18].

Replica approach. – We follow Franz and Parisi [4, 5]: We consider a system of particles which is tightly pinned to a quenched configuration. We imagine that the pinning potential is gradually relaxed and that at each step of this process the system is allowed to equilibrate (according to the Boltzmann measure including the pinning potential). The main assumption is that, if the density is high enough (or if the temperature is low enough) at a certain point the system gets stuck in a metastable state characterized by non-trivial correlations with the quenched configuration. We assume that this metastable state survives in the limit of vanishing pinning potential. Finally, we assume self-averaging and we average over a distribution of quenched configurations using the equilibrium Boltzmann measure. To perform this average we replicate the system and at the end of the analysis we take the limit of the number of replicas of the system r going to zero. Including the quenched configuration, we have $m = r + 1$ replicas and we take the limit $m \to 1$.

Ornstein-Zernicke (OZ) equations. – In a metastable state we can use the standard apparatus of equilibrium statistical mechanics, including replicated OZ equations,

$$\begin{aligned}\delta n_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2) \quad &= \quad n^2 c_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2) \\ &\quad + n\sum_\gamma \int d\mathbf{r}_3 c_{\alpha\gamma}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_3)\delta n_{\gamma\beta}(\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_2).\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Here α, β and γ are replica indices, $\delta n_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2)$ is the nontrivial part of the two-particle density, $\delta n_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2) = n_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2) - n^2$, n is the single-particle density (assumed to be uniform and the same in all replicas) and $c_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2)$ is the direct correlation function. Note that Eqs. (1) essentially define $c_{\alpha\beta}$'s and additional assumptions are needed in order to make use of them.

At this point we assume replica symmetry. We recall that while in Ref. [5] replica non-symmetric correlation functions were allowed, it was found that in the metastable state correlations are replica symmetric. We consider only the metastable state and, thus, we restrict ourselves to replica symmetric correlation functions. We comment further on this issue at the end of this Letter. Specifically, we assume that all replica diagonal correlations are equal, $\delta n_{00} = \delta n_{11} = ... = n^2 h$ and $c_{00} = c_{11} = ... = c$, as are all replica off-diagonal ones, $\delta n_{01} = \delta n_{12} = ... = n^2 \tilde{h}$ and $c_{01} = c_{12} = ... = \tilde{c}$. Using the replica symmetry we easily get the standard OZ equation for the replica diagonal correlations,

$$h(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2) = c(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2) + n\int d\mathbf{r}_3 c(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_3)h(\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_2). \tag{2}$$

Physically, this means that we have equilibrium correlations within each replica.

To get an equation for $\tilde{h}$ we first re-write the replicated OZ equation for $\alpha \neq \beta$ in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int d\mathbf{r}_3(\delta(r_{13}) - nc_{\alpha\alpha}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_3))\delta n_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_2) \\
= \; & n\int d\mathbf{r}_3 c_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_3)(n\delta(r_{32}) + \delta n_{\beta\beta}(\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_2)) \\
&+n\sum_{\gamma\neq\alpha,\gamma\neq\beta}\int d\mathbf{r}_3 c_{\alpha\gamma}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_3)\delta n_{\gamma\beta}(\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_2) \qquad (3)
\end{aligned}$$

In the $m \to 1$ limit from Eq. (3) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int d\mathbf{r}_3(\delta(r_{13}) - nc(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_3))\tilde{h}(\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_2) = \tilde{c}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2) \qquad (4) \\
&+n\int d\mathbf{r}_3\tilde{c}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_3)h(\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_2) - n\int d\mathbf{r}_3\tilde{c}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_3)\tilde{h}(\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_2).
\end{aligned}$$

We note in passing that if we define a new replica off-diagonal correlation function $\bar{h}$ through the following equation

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{h}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2) \; = \; & \int d\mathbf{r}_3 d\mathbf{r}_4(\delta(r_{13}) + nh(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_3))\bar{h}(\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_4) \\
& \times(\delta(r_{42}) + nh(\mathbf{r}_4,\mathbf{r}_2)), \qquad (5)
\end{aligned}$$

we can derive from Eq. (4) a somewhat simpler equation for $\bar{h}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bar{h}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2) = \tilde{c}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2) \qquad (6) \\
&-n\int d\mathbf{r}_3 d\mathbf{r}_4\tilde{c}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_3)(\delta(r_{34}) + nh(\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_4))\bar{h}(\mathbf{r}_4,\mathbf{r}_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Eqs. (5-6) imply that replica off-diagonal correlation function $\tilde{h}$ can be written as a series in which the kth term is a convolution of the form $(-1)^{(k+1)}((\delta + nh)\tilde{c})^k(\delta + nh)$.

At this point we invoke the physically motivated relation [14] between the Fourier transform of the replica off-diagonal correlation function, $\tilde{h}(k)$, and the non-ergodicity parameter [11] of the mode-coupling theory, $f(k)$,

$$n\tilde{h}(k) = S(k)f(k). \qquad (7)$$

Using Eq. (7) we can re-write the Fourier transform of Eq. (4) as

$$\frac{f(k)}{1-f(k)} = nS(k)\tilde{c}(k). \qquad (8)$$

We note the striking resemblance of Eq. (8) and the mode-coupling theory's equation for the non-ergodicity parameter (see, *e.g*, Eq. (2.17) of Ref. [1]) [19]. Specifically, Eq. (8) coincides with the equation for the non-ergodicity parameter *iff* the right-hand-side of this equation can be related to the long-time limit of the appropriate memory function.

We would like to emphasize that the derivation of Eq. (8) did not involve any approximation. The only assumptions used were the existence of a metastable state and the replica symmetry. We believe that Eq. (8) is the first result suggesting a connection between off-diagonal direct correlation function in replica approach and the long-time limit of memory function introduced in dynamic approach.

Metastable state. – The basic assumption of the replica approach is that if the density is high enough (or if the temperature is low enough) the system gets stuck in a metastable state. In the original papers this state was defined as a local minimum of a free energy considered as a functional of the replica off-diagonal correlations [3–5] or a function of the cage radius [6,13,14]. Here we assume that the metastable state is characterized by vanishing particle currents. We note that this condition is qualitatively different than that used in earlier works in that it implicitly depends on the system's dynamics. This is important since we assume metastability only with respect to local dynamics and we admit a possibility that non-local [20] or cluster [21] moves can still equilibrate the system. For concreteness, we will here assume that the system is evolving with Brownian dynamics [22]. In this case we will see that the condition of vanishing particle currents is equivalent to the assumption that the replica off-diagonal correlation functions satisfy the first few equations of the Yvon-Born-Green (YBG) hierarchy [23].

To motivate the assumption of vanishing particle currents we note that the time-independence of the joint density in replicas α and β, $\alpha \neq \beta$, results in the following identity (to simplify notation we assume hereafter that the diffusion coefficient of an isolated particle has been made equal to 1 and that the inverse temperature $1/k_BT$ has been incorporated into the inter-particle force $\mathbf{F}$):

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \; &= \; \partial_t n_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2;t) \\
&= \; -\partial_{\mathbf{r}_1}\mathbf{j}_{\alpha,\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2;t) - \partial_{\mathbf{r}_2}\mathbf{j}_{\beta,\alpha}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2;t) \qquad (9)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{j}_{\alpha,\beta}$ is the joint current density in replica α and particle density in replica β,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{j}_{\alpha,\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_3) \; = \; & -\partial_{\mathbf{r}_1}n_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_3) \qquad (10) \\
& +\int d\mathbf{r}_2\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{r}_{12})n_{\alpha\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,\mathbf{r}_3)
\end{aligned}$$

and, correspondingly, $\mathbf{j}_{\beta,\alpha}$ is the joint current density in replica β and particle density in replica α. In Eq. (10) $n_{\alpha\alpha\beta}$ is the joint two-particle density in replica α and single-particle density in replica β.

The main fundamental assumption of the present approach is that not only $\partial_t n_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ (which is required to have a stationary state) but moreover $\mathbf{j}_{\alpha,\beta} = 0 = \mathbf{j}_{\beta,\alpha}$.

The vanishing of the joint current density in replica α and particle density in replica β leads to the following equation relating $n_{\alpha\beta}$ and $n_{\alpha\alpha\beta}$:

$$-\partial_{\mathbf{r}_1}n_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_3) + \int d\mathbf{r}_2\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{r}_{12})n_{\alpha\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,\mathbf{r}_3) = 0. \qquad (11)$$

In a very similar way, starting from the vanishing of the joint current density in replica β and two-particle density in replica α we obtain an equation relating $n_{\alpha\alpha\beta}$ and the joint two-particle density in replicas α and β, $n_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{j}_{\beta,\alpha\alpha}(\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2) \; = \; & -\partial_{\mathbf{r}_3}n_{\alpha\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,\mathbf{r}_3) \qquad (12) \\
& + \int d\mathbf{r}_4\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{r}_{34})n_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_4) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

We should emphasize here that equations (11-12) are valid only for $\alpha \neq \beta$ and, moreover, in the limit of vanishing pinning potential. Furthermore, we should note that in this limit Eqs. (11-12) are identical to the YBG equations for $n_{\alpha\beta}$ and $n_{\alpha\alpha\beta}$, $\alpha \neq \beta$.

Combining equations (11-12) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\mathbf{r}_1}\partial_{\mathbf{r}_3} n^2 \tilde{h}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_3) &\equiv \partial_{\mathbf{r}_1}\partial_{\mathbf{r}_3} n_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_3) \\ = \int d\mathbf{r}_2 \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{r}_{12}) &\int d\mathbf{r}_4 \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{r}_{34}) n_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_4). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

The physical meaning of Eq. (13) is that correlations between particle densities in different replicas have to be accompanied by correlations of forces in these replicas.

It would be tempting to factorize the four-point function at the right-hand-side of Eq. (13). However, due to non-vanishing three-particle correlations, two-particle densities in replicas α and β can be correlated *via* single-particle density correlations. To take care of this, we use the following decomposition of $n_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}$ which is inspired by similar decompositions of equilibrium densities [24]:

see Eq. (15)

The first term at the right-hand-side of Eq. (15) does not contribute to the force correlations. The second term describes all correlations between two-particle densities in replicas α and β mediated by single-particle correlations. In this term, the brackets $\langle ... \rangle$ denote averaging over the replicated state, $\langle \delta n_{\alpha\alpha} \delta n_{\gamma} \rangle$ is the correlation function of a fluctuation of a microscopic two-particle density in replica α,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta n_{\alpha\alpha}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2) \quad = \quad & \sum_{i\neq j} [\delta(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_{i\alpha})\delta(\mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_{j\alpha}) \\ & - \langle \delta(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_{i\alpha})\delta(\mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_{j\alpha}) \rangle] \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

and a fluctuation of a microscopic single-particle density in replica γ,

$$\delta n_{\gamma}(\mathbf{r}_1) = \sum_i [\delta(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_{i\gamma}) - \langle \delta(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_{i\gamma}) \rangle], \tag{17}$$

and $\langle \delta n_{\gamma} \delta n_{\delta} \rangle^{-1}$ is the inverse of the correlation of single-particle density fluctuations,

$$\langle \delta n_{\gamma}(\mathbf{r}_5) \delta n_{\delta}(\mathbf{r}_6) \rangle^{-1} = \frac{\delta_{\gamma\delta}\delta(\mathbf{r}_5 - \mathbf{r}_6)}{n} - c_{\gamma\delta}(\mathbf{r}_5,\mathbf{r}_6). \tag{18}$$

Finally, the third term at the right-hand-side of Eq. (15), $n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}$, contains correlations between two-particle densities in replicas α and β that are mediated by at least two single-particle correlations. We should emphasize that Eq. (15) is essentially a definition of $n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}$.

Substituting decomposition (15) into Eq. (13) and then using Eq. (11), the first equation of the standard Yvon-Born-Green hierarchy [23], and the replicated OZ equations (1) we obtain the following relation for the replica off-diagonal direct correlation function:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\mathbf{r}_1}\partial_{\mathbf{r}_3} n^2 \tilde{c}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_3) &\equiv \partial_{\mathbf{r}_1}\partial_{\mathbf{r}_3} n^2 c_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_3) \\ = \int d\mathbf{r}_2 \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{r}_{12}) &\int d\mathbf{r}_4 \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{r}_{34}) n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_4) \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

The only assumption used so far is the existence of a metastable state characterized by vanishing currents.

Closure. – Now we are in a position to introduce the main approximation: a factorization of the four-point correlation function $n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}$. For typical interactions (which are strongly repulsive at short distances) a straightforward factorization would result in divergences. To arrive at an alternative factorization approximation we note that Eqs. (5-6) suggest that replica off-diagonal correlations contain, on each side, exact single replica correlations. Thus, to proceed we factor out the single-replica analogs of $n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}$ and factorize only its remaining (middle) part:

see Eq. (21)

Here n^{irr}_{22} is the single replica analog of $n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}$ [25], $(n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{22})^{-1}$ denotes the inverse of n^{irr}_{22} and the brackets $[...]_{\mathrm{fact}}$ denote factorization of the expression in the brackets, *e.g.*,

$$[n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_4)]_{\mathrm{fact}} = n_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_{13}) n_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_{24}) + (1 \leftrightarrow 2). \tag{22}$$

Explicitly, factorization approximation in Eq. (21) leads to the following expression for $n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}$:

see Eq. (24)

We now substitute (24) into Eq. (19), take the Fourier transform, and follow the procedure used in the derivation of the so-called vertices of the mode-coupling theory [9] to obtain the following (approximate) identity

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}\tilde{c}(k) = \frac{n^2}{2} \int \frac{d\mathbf{q}_1 d\mathbf{q}_2}{(2\pi)^3} \delta(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}_1 - \mathbf{q}_2) \\ \times [\mathbf{q}_1 c(q_1) + \mathbf{q}_2 c(q_2)] \, \tilde{h}(q_1) \tilde{h}(q_2) \, [\mathbf{q}_1 c(q_1) + \mathbf{q}_2 c(q_2)] \, . \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

We note that the bare forces in Eq. (19) got replaced by renormalized forces (essentially, gradients of the replica-diagonal direct correlation functions). Technically, this results from including n^{irr}_{22}'s at both "ends" of the approximate expression (24).

Next, we take the longitudinal part of Eq. (25), use the identification (7) and in this way we derive an expression for the replica off-diagonal direct correlation function $\tilde{c}$ in terms of the non-ergodicity parameter f,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{c}(k) = \frac{1}{2k^2} \int \frac{d\mathbf{q}_1 d\mathbf{q}_2}{(2\pi)^3} \delta(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}_1 - \mathbf{q}_2) \\ \times f(q_1) f(q_2) S(q_1) S(q_2) \left(\hat{\mathbf{k}} \cdot [\mathbf{q}_1 c(q_1) + \mathbf{q}_2 c(q_2)] \right)^2 \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Finally, we substitute expression (26) into Eq. (8). The resulting self-consistent equation for the non-ergodicity parameter is identical to the equation derived using the standard mode-coupling theory. In particular, this equation

---

$$\begin{aligned} & n_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_4) = n_{\alpha\alpha}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2) n_{\beta\beta}(\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_4) \\ & + \sum_{\gamma\delta}\int d\mathbf{r}_5 d\mathbf{r}_6 \left\langle \delta n_{\alpha\alpha}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2)\delta n_{\gamma}(\mathbf{r}_5)\right\rangle \left\langle \delta n_{\gamma}(\mathbf{r}_5)\delta n_{\delta}(\mathbf{r}_6)\right\rangle^{-1} \left\langle \delta n_{\delta}(\mathbf{r}_6)\delta n_{\beta\beta}(\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_4)\right\rangle + n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_4) \end{aligned} \qquad (15)$$

$$\begin{aligned} n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_4) \quad \approx \quad & \frac{1}{2^4}\int d\mathbf{r}_5 ... d\mathbf{r}_{12} n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{22}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,\mathbf{r}_5,\mathbf{r}_6) \qquad (21) \\ & \times \left[n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{22}(\mathbf{r}_5,\mathbf{r}_6,\mathbf{r}_7,\mathbf{r}_8)^{-1} n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}(\mathbf{r}_7,\mathbf{r}_8,\mathbf{r}_9,\mathbf{r}_{10}) n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{22}(\mathbf{r}_9,\mathbf{r}_{10},\mathbf{r}_{11},\mathbf{r}_{12})^{-1}\right]_{\mathrm{fact}} n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{22}(\mathbf{r}_{11},\mathbf{r}_{12},\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_4) \end{aligned}$$

---

implies the following relation between $\tilde{c}$ and the long-time limit of the irreducible memory function M^{irr},

$$\tilde{c}(k) = \frac{1}{nk^2}\lim_{t\to\infty} M^{\mathrm{irr}}(k;t). \qquad (27)$$

Discussion. – We have showed that the mode-coupling theory equation for the non-ergodicity parameter can be obtained by combining replica approach, condition of vanishing currents and the factorization approximation for the non-trivial part of the replica-off diagonal static four-point correlation function. One cannot but conclude that, at least as far as the calculation of the non-ergodicity parameter is concerned, the mode-coupling theory is equivalent to the (admittedly mean-field) replica approach. One could even say that in spirit it resembles the Kirkwood-Monroe theory of freezing [26].

Two features of the present development should be emphasized. First, the consistency of replica approach's equation for the off-diagonal correlations and the mode-coupling theory equation for the non-ergodicity parameter is the strongest connection one could expect between the replica approach and the mode-coupling theory. The reason is that the replica approach is an inherently static one and the bulk of mode-coupling theory's predictions are concerned with dynamics. Second, since both replica approach and mode-coupling theory share mean-field character, it is natural to expect that both of them will involve some factorization approximations. The advantage of the replica derivation presented here is that it relies upon a factorization approximation for static correlation functions, albeit for a replicated system.

There are several aspects of our approach that could be investigated further. First, a more accurate factorization approximation should be attempted. It can be argued that Eq. (24) overestimates $n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}$ and this leads to an underestimation of the mode-coupling transition density (or overestimation of the mode-coupling transition temperature). Second, the limit of large spatial dimensions should be investigated. In this limit static correlations simplify and it is possible that factorization approximations could be avoided. Third, replica symmetry should be inspected. In particular, one should investigate breaking symmetry between the 0th replica and the remaining r replicas. A preliminary study suggests that, at least for the hard-sphere interaction and with Percus-Yevick closure for the replica diagonal correlations, this symmetry is not broken. Fourth, dependence of the final equation for the ergodicity breaking parameter on the dynamics should be investigated. In particular, one could try to derive the equation for the non-ergodicity parameter corresponding to Monte Carlo dynamics and to check whether the standard equation for the non-ergodicity parameter changes.

We thank G. Biroli and F. Zamponi for comments on the manuscript and gratefully acknowledge the support of NSF Grant CHE 0909676.

REFERENCES

[1] U. Bengtzelius, W. Götze, and A. Sjölander, J. Phys. C **17** 5915 (1984).

[2] For a recent review see W. Götze, *Complex Dynamics of Glass-Forming Liquids: A Mode-Coupling Theory* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008).

[3] M. Mézard and G. Parisi, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **29** 6515 (1996).

[4] S. Franz and G. Parisi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2486 (1997).

[5] M. Cardenas, S. Franz and G. Parisi, J. Chem. Phys. **110**, 1726 (1999).

[6] M. Mézard and G. Parisi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82** (1999) 747; J. Chem. Phys. **111** 1076 (1999).

[7] M. Fixman, J. Chem. Phys. **36** 310 (1962); K. Kawasaki, Phys. Rev. **150** 291 (1996); L.P. Kadanoff and J. Swift, Phys. Rev. **166** 89 (1968).

[8] M.H. Ernst, E.H. Hauge and J. M. J. van Leeuwen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **25** 1254 (1970).

[9] For a derivation of mode-coupling theory for systems evolving with overdapmed (Brownian) dynamics see G. Szamel and H. Löwen, Phys. Rev. A **44** 8215 (1991).

[10] J.N. Roux, J.L. Barrat, and J.P. Hansen, J. Phys. Cond. Matt. **1**, 7171 (1989); J.L. Barrat, J.N. Roux, and J.P. Hansen, Chem. Phys. **149**, 197 (1990).

[11] The non-ergodicity parameter $f(k)$ is defined in terms of the long-time limit of the intermediate scattering function $F(k;t)$, $f(k) = \lim_{t\to\infty} F(k;t)/S(k)$, where $S(k)$ denotes the static structure factor, $S(k) = 1 + nh(k)$.

[12] F. Sciortino and W. Kob, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 648 (2001).

[13] G. Parisi and F. Zamponi, J. Chem. Phys. **123**, 144501 (2005).

$$n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_4) \approx \frac{1}{2}\int d\mathbf{r}_5...d\mathbf{r}_{12} n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{22}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2;\mathbf{r}_5,\mathbf{r}_6)\left(n^{-1}\delta(\mathbf{r}_{57})-c(r_{57})\right)\left(n^{-1}\delta(\mathbf{r}_{68})-c(r_{68})\right) \\ \times n_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_7,\mathbf{r}_9)n_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_8,\mathbf{r}_{10})\left(n^{-1}\delta(\mathbf{r}_{9,11})-c(r_{9,11})\right)\left(n^{-1}\delta(\mathbf{r}_{10,12})-c(r_{10,12})\right)n^{\mathrm{irr}}_{22}(\mathbf{r}_{11},\mathbf{r}_{12};\mathbf{r}_3,\mathbf{r}_4) \quad (24)$$

[14] G. Parisi and F. Zamponi, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 789 (2010).

[15] See T.R. Kirkpatrick and D. Thirumalai, Transp. Theor. Stat. Phys. **24**, 927 (1995) and references therein.

[16] B. Schmid and R. Schilling, Phys. Rev. E **81**, 041502 (2010).

[17] A. Ikeda and K. Miyazaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 255704 (2010).

[18] The equation for the tagged particle localization length derived from a simplified mode-coupling theory has been showed to coincide with the equation derived from the so-called naive density-functional approach [T.R. Kirkpatrick and P.G. Wolynes, Phys. Rev. A **35**, 3072 (1987)].

[19] The resemblance of Eq. (8) and the mode-coupling theory's equation for the non-ergodicity parameter can be used to further justify the identification (7) of the replica off-diagonal correlations and the non-ergodicity parameter.

[20] T. Grigera and G. Parisi, Pys. Rev. E **63**, 045102(R) (2001).

[21] L. Santen and W. Krauth, Nature **405**, 550 (2000).

[22] We anticipate that our procedure can be adapted to Newtonian dynamics with only minor additional assumptions.

[23] J.P. Hansen and I.R. McDonald, *Theory of Simple Liquids* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2006).

[24] J. Bławzdziewicz, B. Cichocki and R. Hołyst, Physica A **157**, 857 (1989); H.C. Andersen, J. Phys. Chem. B **106**, 8326 (2002).

[25] Strictly speaking, n^{irr}_{22} also includes additional terms involving δ functions. Thus, the structure of Eq. (21) is analogous to that of Eq. (5).

[26] J.G. Kirkwood and E. Monroe, J. Chem. Phys. **9**, 514 (1941).